

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 5, 12 and 20 have been amended; no new matter has been added. Support for these amendments can be found at least in the specification in page 2, line 20 – page 3, line 14.

Claims 5-6 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Although applicant respectfully disagrees, to further prosecution claim 5-6 have been amended to recite a server. No new matter has been added. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least on Page 5, lines 27-34.

Accordingly, claims 5-6 comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully requests removal of these rejections.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Ficco et al. (USP 6,868,292, hereinafter “Ficco”). Independent claims 1, 5, 12 and 20 have been amended to recite the limitations of: “wherein said second documents reflect a status of the plurality of applications devices.”

Applicants can find nothing in Ficco that teaches the limitations of: “A method of controlling *a plurality of application devices* the method comprising the steps of:

...generating second documents by the server, each comprising at least one instruction, on the basis of at least a part of the retrieved identification of the user and at least a part of the first documents, *wherein said second documents reflect a status of the of the plurality of applications devices...*”

Independent claim 20 has been further amended to recite the limitations of: “wherein said one instruction includes instruction for changing parameters and/or settings of the particular device to reflect a setting of the user.” Applicants can find nothing in Ficco that teaches these limitations

Because Ficco fails to teach each of the elements of each of the Appellant's independent claims 1, 5, 12 and 20, as amended, the Appellant respectfully maintains that the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Ficco cannot be maintained. Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1, 5, 12 and 20, as amended, are allowable.

With regard to claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13-19 these claims depend from an independent claim discussed above, which have been shown to be allowable in view of the cited reference. Accordingly, each of claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13-19 are also allowable by virtue of its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Applicant denies any statement, position or averment stated in the Office Action that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing. Any rejection and/or points of argument not

addressed are moot in view of the presented arguments and no arguments are waived and none of the statements and/or assertions made in the Office Action is conceded.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. Entry of this amendment and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079

Date: January 7, 2011

/Thomas J. Onka/
By: Thomas J. Onka
Attorney for Appellant
Registration No. 42,053

Mail all correspondence to:

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615